

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of January 11, 2007, has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 are rejected by the Examiner.

Applicants have amended the preambles to Claims 1 and 12 to more clearly define the inventions as claimed, and also have amended Claim 9 to fix the grammar. No new matter has been introduced.

#### **Supplemental IDS**

Applicants note that two Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) were filed for this application, one on December 3, 2004; and the other on May 11, 2005. The Examiner did not return the initialed 1449 forms for these two Supplemental IDS filings. Applicants request the Examiner to provide these initialed forms with the next action.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being disclosed by Ogawa et al. (EP Patent No. 1475721). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner lists the elements of Claim 1, and then states that Ogawa discloses Claim 1 by referring generally to a large block of paragraphs in Ogawa (paragraphs 0024-0034) to support this. The Examiner provides no further explanation of how each and every feature recited in Claim 1 is disclosed by Ogawa. Applicants respectfully assert that this does not provide Applicants with a reasonable basis to address this rejection. Applicants assert that the pertinent part of this reference as applicable to each feature recited by Claim 1 has not been clearly explained, as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to clearly indicate **with specificity** the text of Ogawa used to reject **each** feature of Claim 1, or to withdraw this rejection.

Further, Applicants assert that paragraphs 0024-0034 of Ogawa do not disclose all the features as recited in Claim 1. For example, Ogawa fails to disclose, *inter alia*, receiving a certificate; or calculating an identifier of the received certificate and converting it to a character string. Further, Ogawa fails to disclose modifying the string by removing at least one random character from the string; or displaying the modified string; or receiving, from a user previously provided with the identifier through a trusted medium, input corresponding to the at least one removed character. Applicants assert that Ogawa fails to disclose the invention as recited by Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 12, the Examiner simply lists the elements of Claim 12, and states the rejection uses the same rationale as Claim 1. Applicants traverse this rejection for the same reason. Applicants assert that the Examiner has not provided enough clarity for Applicants to respond, in that the Examiner has not shown with specificity how Ogawa discloses each and every feature as recited in Claim 12. Further, Applicants assert that Ogawa does not disclose, *inter alia*, a processor performing steps including: receiving, via the interface, a certificate from a remotely located server, or calculating an identifier of the received certificate and converting it to a character string, or modifying the string by removing at least one random character from the string. Further, Ogawa fails to disclose displaying the modified string, or receiving, from a user of the device previously provided with the identifier through a trusted medium, input corresponding to the at least one removed character.

Regarding Claims 13 and 14, the Examiner provides similar rejections as provided for Claim 12: the claim elements are listed, and a statement that the claim is rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1. Applicants traverse these rejections for the same reasons as stated for Claims 1 and 12 above. Applicants assert that Ogawa does not disclose each and every element as recited in Claims 13 and 14, and Applicants request the Examiner to show with specificity how Ogawa discloses each and every element of these claims, or to withdraw this rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 are allowable.

Regarding dependent Claims 2-11, the Examiner provides similar rejections that provide no clarity as to how Ogawa discloses the features of these claims. Applicants assert that these claims depend from allowable independent claims, and are therefore allowable. Further, Applicants assert that Ogawa fails to disclose the specific features of each of these dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants assert that these claims are allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2007

By: /David D. Lowry/  
David D. Lowry  
Registration No. 38,538  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
28 State Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02109-1775  
Telephone: 617-720-9600  
Fax: 617-720-9601